

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/726,383	12/03/2003	Yoshihiro Someno	9281-4722	5589
7590 09/28/2004 Brinks Hofer Gilson & Lione			EXAMINER	
P.O. Box 10395		LAM, CATHY FONG FONG		
Chicago, IL 6	0610		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			1775	
· · · · · · · · ·			DATE MAILED: 09/28/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Ap	plication No.	Applicant(s)		
		10	/726,383	SOMENO ET AL.		
	Office Action Summa	iry Exa	aminer	Art Unit		
		Cat	thy Lam	1775		
	The MAILING DATE of this co					
Period fe	or Reply					
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt Any	HORTENED STATUTORY PER MAILING DATE OF THIS COM ensions of time may be available under the pir SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of the period for reply specified above is less than D period for reply is specified above, the maxure to reply within the set or extended period reply received by the Office later than three red patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.7	MUNICATION.  rovisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).  nis communication.  thirty (30) days, a reply within  immy statutory period will app  for reply will, by statute, cause  months after the mailing date of	In no event, however, may a reply be the statutory minimum of thirty (30) d. ly and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro	timely filed  ays will be considered timely.  m the mailing date of this communication.		
Status						
1)	Responsive to communication	(s) filed on				
2a)□	This action is FINAL.	2b)⊠ This action	on is non-final			
3)						
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims	,				
		Object to the control of the control				
4)[2]	Claim(s) <u>1-3</u> is/are pending in			•		
د، ا	4a) Of the above claim(s) 3 is/a		onsideration.			
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
	Claim(s) <u>1 and 2</u> is/are rejecte					
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected					
8)	Claim(s) are subject to	restriction and/or elec	ction requirement.			
Applicati	ion Papers					
9)□	The specification is objected to	by the Examiner.		,		
	The drawing(s) filed on <u>03 Dec</u>		)⊠ accepted or b)□ objec	ted to by the Evaminer		
	Applicant may not request that any	v objection to the drawir	ng(s) he held in abevance. So	22 37 CED 1 85(a)		
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) inc					
11)[]	The oath or declaration is object	ted to by the Examin	er. Note the attached Office	o Action or form DTO 452		
		ted to by the Examin	er. Note the attached Offici	e Action of form PTO-152.		
	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)🛛 .	Acknowledgment is made of a d		ty under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	a)-(d) or (f).		
a)[	⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None	of:				
	<ol> <li>Certified copies of the pr</li> </ol>	iority documents have	e been received.			
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
	application from the Inter	national Bureau (PC	T Rule 17 2(a))	od III tillo National Otage		
* S	ee the attached detailed Office			ed		
			doranied dopied flot receiv	cu.		
Attachment	• •					
Notice Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Rev	iou (DTO 045)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)		
3) Inform	e of Draπsperson's Patent Drawing Rev nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-14	Iew (PTO-948) I49 or PTO/SR/09)	Paper No(s)/Mail D  5) Notice of Informal F	ate Patent Application (PTO-152)		
Paper	No(s)/Mail Date <u>12-03-2003</u> .	170 SEF E (10/30/00)	6) Other:	atent Application (FTO-152)		
. Patent and Tra OL-326 (Re	ademark Office					
323 (116	27. I (VT)	Office Action Su	immary Pa	art of Paper No./Mail Date 20040924		

Application/Control Number: 10/726,383 Page 2

Art Unit: 1775

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-2, drawn to a functional multilayer film, classified in class 385, subclass 49+.
- Claim 3, drawn to a method for manufacturing a functional multilayer film, classified in class 33, subclass 645.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

- 2. Inventions II and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the method as claimed can be used to make a different product such as a multilayer wiring board. The product as claimed can be made by a different process such as by manually placing each fine metallic body into the grooves of the substrate, then bonding the plurality of substrates together by adhesive.
- 3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- During a telephone conversation with Atty: G. Siller on September 25, 2004 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of group I, claims
   Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office

Application/Control Number: 10/726,383

Art Unit: 1775

action. Claim 3 is withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is vague and indefinite, as it is not clear whether or not it means different dielectric materials between thin films and different metallic materials between the fine metallic bodies? Clarification is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pugh, III (US 4046454) or Miller (US 3864018) in view of Li et al (US 6377732).

Application/Control Number: 10/726,383

Art Unit: 1775

Both Pugh, III and Miller teach a waveguide structure comprised of optical fibers.

Pugh teaches a plurality of chips (10,11) each has uniformly spaced V-grooves (14) formed on the chip's surface. Each groove (14) receives a single optical fiber (22) (col 2 L 17-20 & Figs. 1-2).

The chips (10,11) are made of dielectric material such as fused quartz or crystalline silicon and are stacked together (col 3 L 48-49).

Miller discloses a multiple linear arrays of optical fiber. The structure is comprised of chips (10) having a plurality of spaced grooves (11) and optical fibers (15) are placed into the grooves (11) (col 2 L 35-39 & Fig. 4).

Both Pugh and Miller are silent about the optical fiber is a metallic material.

Li discloses an optical waveguide comprised of a silicon substrate (10), groove and an optical fiber (20).

A V-groove is formed in the substrate (10) and an optical fiber (20) is formed into the groove (22). The optical fiber (20) is metal coated fiber (34) (col 5 L 12-13, Figs. 2-3).

In view of the prior art teachings, it would have been obvious to fabricate a functional multilayer film with a metallized optical fiber because it enhances the bonding between the fiber and the substrate.

Regarding to claim 2, the examiner is taking the position that applicant is claiming that the dielectric thin film and the fine metallic bodies are made of different material. Such limitation is met by Li, since the dielectric is made of silicon or silica substrate and the optical fiber is a metal coated fiber (col 2 L 22-23 & col 5 L 10-13).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cathy Lam whose telephone number is (571) 272-1538. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Deborah Jones can be reached on (571) 272-1535. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cathy Lam

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1775

cfl September 25, 2004